

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 16, 2005 LB 72

my mind, it's a barrier to entry. So if Senator Kopplin wants to start up a security business, it's harder for him to do that and compete with me when I already have a security business. So I do think that, even though people don't come in and testify in opposition, there's a reason, and the reason is that these types of bills, in my mind, are barriers to entry. There's a definition of protective services or, excuse me, there is a word, a phrase, "protective services," on page 2, line 5, but it's not defined. There's no definition that I saw for "security service," page 2, line 9. The bill allows the Secretary of State to set out to give permits for firearms, so these individuals can carry firearms, and yet there's no training. It does say firearm training, but it doesn't say what kind. Does it mean they have to...anyway, it's just not defined and I think that that should be defined. If we are going to allow these folks to carry guns, the training...at least we should know, if we're going to delegate this authority to the Secretary of State, we should know what type of training there is going to be. When can the Secretary of State revoke a security officer's license? There isn't a mechanism, as I saw it, in the bill, and you all know that if someone has a license to do something the state can't take it away without some sort of a hearing. That's called due process. And I don't...I don't see the mechanism or how the Secretary of State can revoke a license. I think that's a problem. It says other sanctions the Secretary of State can impose on a licensee, other than revoking their license. And what are those sanctions? We don't know. What revocation procedures are established by the act? It's not clear. And I do want to know why the Secretary of State is given total discretion as it relates to setting the licensing fee for security officers. We always have placed a cap on those because of delegation issues. The Legislature delegates its authority to an agency, and yet we usually set a range. But in this instance there's no range. The Secretary of State could charge anything. Again, I mention that there is no guarantee in the bill of an administrative hearing and/or an appeal prior to a license being revoked. Someone could argue that that is a due process violation. I think that's a concern. The bill doesn't, as I read it, doesn't discuss individuals who are currently working in the field. I'm not aware of the grandfather provisions. Does everybody have to be...take these new tests